

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**ART REJECTION:**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 2,4,6,14,16,19,21,24,26,29,31,33,35,37,40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayanakis et al(Kayanakis) for the reasons of record as discussed in previous Office Actions, since the amendments to these claims are merely combinations of previously addressed and rejected subject matter.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 5,15,20,25,30,36, and 41 are allowed.

**REMARKS:**

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2011 have been fully considered but they are only deemed partially persuasive with regards to claims 5,15,20,25,30,36, and 41.

Applicant is arguing that the reference to Kayanakis does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of newly amended claims 2 and 6. However, as discussed in the art rejection above, and as well, in previous Office actions, the examiner does not deem that a modification to Kayanakis, such as placing the antenna or circuit on an outer surface of the overlays would change the principle of the operation of Kayanakis. Benefits of placing the antenna on an outer surface, such as increased antenna

reception, would have been inherent, and therefore deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The motivation to augment the system of Kayanakis in a manner as described in the claimed subject matter, would have been an obvious improvement of reception performance. Furthermore, as discussed in the "Response to Arguments" section in the art rejection dated 5/31/2010, the claimed connection of the circuits to the antenna through an opening in the substrate would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since this would have provided an unobtrusive means of connecting the antenna with the circuit. The concept of making physical connections between two objects of devices, through a hole or opening is not a novel concept. The benefits of making this connection between interior and exterior components of any system are inherent, and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore is not deemed a patentable concept, regardless of whether or not it is utilized in a Thin Film Integrated Circuit, or any system that requires connection of devices positioned on opposite sides of a structure. In view of this the applicant's arguments are not deemed persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARYL POPE whose telephone number is (571)272-2959. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MIKE RAZAVI can be reached on 571-272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DARYL POPE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612